

How Russia Might Win WW3: Peter Vincent Pry

(2022/03/26)



"What we are seeing is a fiction... the bigger conflict is coming". Dr. Peter Vincent Pry, breaks down his theories about what's actual going on in the Far East. (Russia, China, Ukraine ...)

Transcript: (auto generated)

0:00

russia is fighting the war in ukraine with its fingers not with its fists what we're seeing on the ground

0:06

is concocted and it's fiction that uh is intended to deceive us if russia wanted

0:12

to defeat the nato alliance it could do a nuclear emp attack on nato and the resulting emp field would black out

0:18

electric grids from ireland all the way to the edge of ukraine nato would in effect be paralyzed by that one blow

0:25

would the united states put itself at risk to save nato europe did the russians really believe that we would do

0:31

that the russians know that you can certainly win a nuclear war and i think they're calling our bluff

0:36

right now

0:44

hi folks canadian prepper here so today on the channel we have a very special guest dr peter vincent pry he is

0:51

executive director of the task force on national and homeland security served as chief of staff of the congressional emp

0:57

commission i've spoken about him and his work on this channel many times before i work for the cia and a variety of other

1:04

places i'm sure has a couple phds and he's going to talk all about nuclear

1:09

vulnerabilities on the nato side of things how a nuclear exchange between nato and russia might play out maybe

1:17

give some insights uh whatever he can on the current situation that's going on and

1:22

while we have people here i know some people have a short attention span so i think it's very important that you guys

1:29

stick around for this talk because dr price is going to talk about a fundamental belief that we as westerners

1:35

have which is basically that our perception of nuclear weapons is one of

1:43

nuclear deterrence and most of us have been indoctrinated into the belief that

1:49

a nuclear war is not only unwinnable but uh unthinkable okay that's because of something called mutually assured

1:56

destruction the idea that if we did start lobbying nukes back and forth we of course would destroy ourselves now dr

2:02

bryan is going to challenge you on that in the sense that in the east they don't possess this fundamental belief they in

2:09

fact view things uh quite differently where it's almost as cut and dry as we

2:14

drive on the right side of the road they drive on the left side of the road in the east they actually believe they can

2:20

win a nuclear war and they base their whole military strategy around that so

2:25

without further ado i'm just gonna let uh dr pry talk all about all about that and everything else so

2:33

let us know what you think about this dr pry sure the idea that a nuclear war is

2:38

unwinnable is deeply embedded in our in our strategic culture and in the

2:44

values of judeo-christian civilization uh which believe in just war theory

2:50

not limiting collateral damage you know to civilian populations

2:56

and because free societies that are based on democracies or republics the most valuable thing in them at least

3:02

theoretically is supposed to be the people and so weapons of mass destruction that threaten the people uh uh is

3:10

almost inconceivable for such societies the place place the highest value on human life as uh

3:17

as the idea that a nuclear war or use of weapons of mass destruction type war would be winnable because you're

3:23

destroying the thing that is most value to you but the strategic cultures of authoritarian and totalitarian states

3:30

that don't place their highest value on the lives of the people but place their highest values on for example in

3:36

ideology uh or place their and and on the elites that run that society and who

3:42

are the ideological spearheads of that society whether it's a belief in the great russian nationalism or belief in

3:48

communism or a belief in the semi-divine status of kim jong-un of

3:55

north korea or or a belief in in radical islam

4:00

uh if that is your highest value and people are just a means to that end then

4:06

you can conceive of victory in a circumstance where you've lost millions of lives in a conflict uh if you achieve

4:13

your political geostrategic ideological goals uh you can see this for example in the

4:20

soviet victory in world war ii where they lost 30 million lives not casualties but 30 million dead

4:26

in fact conquering the very area that they have invaded today in ukraine they're called the bloodlands the area

4:33

from ukraine uh into eastern europe of the bloodlands where 30 million soviet soldiers died and that's considered a

4:39

great victory even though it cost them 30 million lives uh in the west we have never

4:45

made such sacrifice uh lost such a large proportion of our population america's uh the united

4:52

states lost in world war ii was a few hundred thousand people not nothing like 30 million people and we probably

4:58

wouldn't have considered it a victory if we had to pay such an awful uh such an awful cost

5:04

now this uh uh we have very different strategic cultures you have to remember that

5:11

particularly here in north america i think for canadians and for uh in the united states both we've had a

5:17

long history where we've been isolated from the wars of europe and asia by the atlantic and pacific oceans the only

5:24

really big war that we've had here in the united states was the american civil war the bloodiest war we've ever fought

5:30

750 000 people uh lost in that in that war but for the most part we've had a

5:36

very good life here in north america you know our focus is by not economic prosperity

5:42

living the good life uh we've gotten involved in wars overseas when we think we've had to but we've

5:49

never experienced the kind of mass destruction on our own territories that a country like russia

5:55

has for example that has a very different strategic culture than ours that going back before modern times you

6:03

know going back to the times of the mongols and before that have have been uh exposed to numerous

6:10

invasions by other countries have had mass destruction of their civilian population uh you know uh those that we

6:18

know of you know beginning around a thousand a day or so invasions by the mongols invasions by the swedish empire

6:26

uh you know invasions by uh germany before it was a book in pre-modern times uh you know

6:33

there were christian crusades launched out of germany against uh against uh part of russia uh invaded by napoleon

6:40

invaded by germany again in world war one and then by hitler so their strategic culture is

6:47

one uh where the expectation of what i i would call a

6:52

paranoid strategic culture it's paranoid from our perspective but from their perspective given their history uh it's

7:00

not paranoid to think wow we're going to get invaded uh you know that happens very frequently and they've got to be

7:06

prepared for for a massive war that's going to be fought on their territory in

7:12

a war of total war that's aimed at the destruction of their people that's a that's a belief that's ingrained in

7:18

russian strategic culture in a way that it isn't ingrained in ours where we're much more used to peace

7:24

and to limited wars of limited objectives where we're not out to wage genocidal

7:30

wars against our our adversaries in fact we like to reconstruct them and turn them into democracies if that's as if

7:36

that's possible when when when we win a war and as a consequence of our belief that

7:42

a nuclear war is unwinnable because it would be such a destructive thing we have postured our strategic

7:49

forces people think that the russian nuclear posture and our nuclear posture are the same they're not they're they're

7:55

as different as night and day we have it's true that both sides have intercontinental ballistic missiles and

8:02

submarines and strategic bombers but that's about where the similarity ends

8:08

our strategic posture is positioned for transparency and for

8:13

avoiding nuclear war and deterring it so most of our weapons are not on intercontinental ballistic missiles

8:20

icbms which can be launched in minutes we've even downloaded our the warheads off of our icbms so

8:26

every icbm only carries a single warhead this is a signal to russia that we don't plan a first strike against them because

8:33

if you were planning the first strike you build up your icbm force you put multiple warheads on it so that one

8:39

missile could take out many silos many targets but we don't do that in fact the icbm force is the smallest part of our

8:46

triad we rely much more heavily on sub-launch ballistic missiles that are not equipped

8:51

with intercontinental ballistic missiles they have intermediate range missiles so our submarines have to put to sea in

8:58

order to attack russia and they can see when our submarines are in port you know we don't we don't keep most of them at

9:04

sea only in about a third of them are at uh are out at sea to be survivable the most of them are at port and our

9:11

adversaries can see that so these they can see we haven't mobilized our forces to launch a surprise attack against them

9:18

and the bombers well the bombers uh are we have more warheads on them than we have on the icbms too and it takes three

9:25

days to mobilize our bomber force so it's something that they would see us doing we're not postured to make a

9:30

surprise attack every day the russians are different you know they have never forgotten the many surprise attacks that

9:37

they've suffered including operation barbarossa which was when nazi germany almost conquered the soviet union and

9:42

almost destroyed it in a massive surprise attack and their general staff says we're never going to be surprised

9:48

again if there's ever another war we're going to be the ones making their surprise attack and they have postured

9:53

their strategic forces to do that exactly most of their warheads are on intercontinental ballistic missiles that

10:00

are ready to launch in a few minutes uh the uh even their ballistic missile submarines carry intercontinental

10:06

ballistic missiles so they don't have to put to sea in order to attack us they can launch right from port side and and

10:13

strike us just like the land-based icbm force even their ballistic missile submarines at sea

10:18

unlike us you know they don't send their they usually don't send their submarines into the deep oceanic areas of the pacific in

10:25

the atlantic uh they're afraid that we would use our attack submarines to surprise them and attack their ballistic

10:31

missile submarine so they protect their submarines from surprise attack by keeping them in bastion areas this white

10:37

sea and the sea of art husk which are heavily defended by their navy now underwater they have cables across the

10:43

bottom of these seas so that their submarines can clandestinely hook in to the general staff command and control

10:49

network so we can't even listen in if they're sending communications unlocking codes emergency

10:55

action messages they can get all of that secretly by these cables just like all the other missile forces of russia they

11:02

can raise the mobilization of their forces secretly we won't see it and then they could launch their surprise attack

11:09

the only part of the of the russian strategic forces that's highly visible for us

11:14

is their bomber force you know the bombers just because of the nature of bombers they've got to be fueled up they

11:19

have to have pilots you've got to upload the nuclear weapons that's a very a highly visible thing but they they have

11:25

practiced and have exercised not mobilizing the bomber force so that we would see oh the bomber force isn't

11:33

mobilized that's a clue that they're not getting ready for a surprise attack and they would open hope that we would

11:38

misinterpret you know the non-mobilization of bombers uh so that we would not raise our posture and in

11:45

effect that's exactly where we are today this so far has sounded like a theoretical discussion but a couple of

11:51

sundays ago on february 27 dictator of russia vladimir putin declared a special

11:56

combat alert for his strategic nuclear forces and he went down into one of the hundreds of deep underground command and

12:03

control shelters these are huge underground facilities buried under hundreds of meters of solid granite that

12:09

can accommodate each of one of them can accommodate like 30 000 russian military and political elites they're impervious

12:15

to nuclear attack by us it's one of the evidences that they believe you can fight and win a nuclear war because

12:21

their elites at least can survive it but they also have massive civil defense capabilities for their civilian

12:27

population too for example all the subways the huge subway system in moscow

12:32

has black nuclear blast doors on it none of our subways have something like that so that you can get the population of

12:38

moscow down into the subways close the doors and they would have a much better chance of surviving a nuclear attack

12:44

than than we would if something like that were to happen but the last thing any adversary whether it's the russians

12:51

or the united states is going to attack is the cities anyway you know because the objective of of a

12:57

nuclear war if you want to win it is to disarm your adversary to destroy his

13:02

bombers his icbms his submarines and port that's what their first strike plan

13:07

would be about and then you can hold the cities hostage and say surrender now but we're going to start taking out your

13:13

cities one by one that's been the russian plan they have never

13:19

agreed with the idea of mutual assured destruction they have encouraged us to believe in the mutual insured

13:25

destruction so that we will not copy their plan a war winning plan they want us to just focus on nuclear deterrence

13:32

and let us hope that it's not too late okay because uh the biden administration has been

13:38

unwilling to admit that the russia has really gone to an increased readiness level with its nuclear forces uh and i

13:46

think that that is that's being done for political reasons they don't want to come bound their

13:51

humiliation in afghanistan with an even worse humiliation and have to explain to the american people you know why has

13:58

ukraine policy what's so important about ukraine to the west that we are willing to go to the verge of a nuclear war with

14:04

russia about it and i'm not just blaming biden here you know the chicken hawks of the republican party are all for jumping

14:11

into ukraine and and getting us involved in a war in ukraine and that's because they're being

14:17

encouraged you know by all almost all of our information about what's happening on the ground in

14:22

ukraine is coming from the ukrainian government which wants us to join and jump and jump in and get involved in the

14:28

war and help ukrainians win and it's also come from coming from the administration because the biden

14:34

administration doesn't want president biden doesn't want the conversation to be about his throwing away of

14:41

50 years of american credibility you know our guarant security guarantees

14:46

to our allies are all based on our credibility and that and that uh and that credibility is a precious thing but

14:53

he put it all on the line in ukraine by drawing a line in the sand and saying russia don't cross that line and putin

14:59

went across that line with tanks biden and his people in the white house

15:04

don't want the conversation to be about that so they have an interest too in convincing us well he crossed the line

15:11

but the russians aren't winning they're doing very badly in ukraine they're bogged down they're losing the war

15:17

but this encourages people to want to involve us in the war to jump into the war and i think that would be a grave

15:22

mistake because i don't think we can trust what we're being told about the status of the war the fog of war is very

15:29

thick especially when all of the intelligence is coming from two biased sources the ukrainian government and the

15:36

and the biden white house the last thing they want to admit is that the russians are getting what they want in ukraine we

15:42

are probably making a a very serious error in assuming that

15:48

the russians are losing it could be that what we're hearing every night on television is true maybe that's true but

15:54

i would remind you that it was less than a year ago that in afghanistan you know we thought it was

16:01

true that we could withdraw from afghanistan and have an afghan government that was sympathetic to the

16:07

west and that they would not immediately fall and uh and that we basically wouldn't have been have to withdraw any

16:14

humiliating defeat at the hands of the taliban uh our department of defense and our joint chiefs led by you know the the

16:21

chairman of the joint chiefs this was our most important thing the credibility of the biden administration depended upon it but they couldn't even defeat

16:28

the taliban in the end we did suffer a humiliating defeat by them we should be mindful before we get

16:35

involved in a war over ukraine to remember that our new nuclear deterrent is not modern the way russia's is that

16:42

it's 30 years old all the delivery systems were built under the reagan administration the nuclear weapons

16:48

themselves are are more than 30 years old they've not been tested in 30 years

16:54

uh we've been patching them up and hoping that they'll work a lot of our own nuclear weapons scientists who

16:59

designed those weapons have been warning that you can't monkey around with a nuclear weapon design like that and have

17:05

high confidence that it's going to work not only has russia got modern delivery systems and modern nuclear weapons it

17:12

has super weapons that have no counterpart in the us nuclear arsenal weapons designed to make what are called

17:18

super emp attacks this is a an electromagnetic field that could theoretically win a nuclear war with a

17:23

single blow by frying the electronics in our forces as well as in our civilian

17:28

society electric grids uh weapons that just generate x-rays so that their anti-missile systems will work and by

17:35

the way that's another sign of the russian belief that they can fight and win a nuclear war they've got 10 000

17:41

anti-ballistic and anti-aircraft missiles 10 000 of them and they are dual capable they can carry conventional

17:47

and nuclear weapons you know we have fewer than 100 uh uh anti-missile systems in our national missile defense

17:54

and they're not even capable of we have grave questions about how effective they would be against the

18:00

north korean missile threat because the north korean missiles are based on chinese and russian technology which is

18:06

a lot more advanced than what we thought the north koreans would end up with the russians also have a unilateral

18:11

advantage in biological and chemical weapons because they've cheated on both of those treaties just as they've

18:17

treated on the technical nuclear weapons treaty the presidential nuclear initiative and they have at least a ten

18:22

to one advantage in technical nuclear weapons i'm going to propose to you and i'm not saying this is the ground truth in

18:28

ukraine but i'm going to propose to you an alternative reality something you're not going to hear from anybody else i'm

18:35

pretty sure uh that is not uh you know there's a different way of interpreting the facts on the ground in

18:41

ukraine uh and it's the austerlitz scenario you know we're all convinced and uh guys

18:47

like senator graham want us to jump in and get involved in the war because the ukrainians are telling us that they're

18:53

killing russians at the rate of 10 to 1 and the russians uh you know are on the verge of defeat and if we only come in

18:59

and help them that we can quickly defeat the russians that's what everybody thinks

19:04

with a hundred percent certainty is the truth on the ground and i say the fog of war is so thick and the circumstance is

19:11

such that we can't trust that maybe it's true but i don't know it's true this could be an alternative you know maybe

19:18

this is all being done deliberately by the russians and they want us to think that they're bogged down and they want us to think that they're losing the

19:24

battle because they want us to jump into the into the uh into the ukrainian war

19:29

and crush us with that ten to one advantage in tactical nuclear weapons the advantage in biological and chemical

19:35

weapons their advantage in cyber weapons and just crush us and permanently solve the problem of nato in the united states

19:42

you know uh it might be more about taking over ukraine uh it might be more than taking over ukraine in terms of the

19:49

russian objective maybe what they want to do is just change the world order by becoming the top dog in that world order

19:55

and how is the battle of australia relevant to this well the russian general staff are great students of

20:00

military history austerlitz was there was napoleon's greatest victory in 1805

20:06

and uh they make particular study of that one because the victory was over

20:11

russia itself you know the combined armies the greatest powers of of europe

20:17

uh of uh of uh the mainland europe were involved in that battle uh russia

20:23

austria and prussia were all allied together on one side against napoleon against the french army and napoleon you

20:30

know uh where it was fought was closer to russia so he was uh napoleon wanted

20:35

to create the impression that he was going to lose this battle you know uh he sent intelligence to the

20:40

russians and austria that he was overextended that he had supply problems that he didn't have enough men he

20:46

deliberately occupied the worst part of the battlefield uh he had uh troops defect to the russians and austria to

20:52

tell them uh oh we're beaten you know we're not going to lose this war you know he actually had whole regiments of

20:58

french troops retreat from the russians all of this was to lure them into attacking and uh and to and have battled

21:04

there on what had been napoleon's chosen ground so that he could then unleash a

21:10

number of core that he could see concealed from view and he crushed the combined forces of russia prussia and

21:16

austria and it gave napoleon dominance over europe for the next decade so these crowned

21:23

heads of europe while he didn't take over their countries they were basically bootlickers to napoleon and had to do

21:29

whatever he said until napoleon made the fatal decision to invade russia and uh and stayed too long but it could be i

21:36

submit and i'm not saying that this is the scenario that's happening it could be that russians are bogged down and they're losing but i but i don't think i

21:44

think we have to be more imaginative and think about well what are other scenarios that may be possible is it possible that they actually want us to

21:50

intervene it's hard to resist the conclusion that a lot of the things the russians are doing

21:55

are deliberately intended to provoke us you know there's it there are a few things that are harder for the western

22:02

democracies to resist than intervening against a cruel dictator an inhuman

22:08

dictator who seems to be militarily weak and and and so it will be easy to defeat

22:13

him uh and that seems to be an impression that putin maybe maybe it's true that he is that but it's

22:20

certainly an impression he's doing nothing to discourage uh and by by his day-to-day behavior

22:26

there's another scenario about ukraine that we ought to keep in mind uh everybody has assumed going into this

22:32

and i have to admit even myself that if the russians invaded ukraine they would want a quick victory

22:38

you know because here i forgot about my own lesson about mirror imaging you know about uh you know that we ought not to

22:45

assume that our enemies think the way we do and would wage war the way the west would we always want a quick victory we

22:52

want the killing and the battles to be over as possible as soon as possible and to capture the territory as soon as

22:58

possible and we had a reason to think that russia might do that in ukraine because of the way they took over crimea

23:03

you know they did it in lightning speed very little bloodshed and it was a great victory for them but there was another

23:10

scenario going on right under our noses that we appear to have ignored and that's what's happened to la hanskön the

23:16

head done the the battle the long war the long siege war that's been going on in

23:22

eastern ukraine that's been going on for eight years the russians at any time could have ended that war they could

23:28

have decisively taken over that area but they haven't they deliberately wanted to have a protracted war in that area maybe

23:35

what putin wants is to uh is to permanently have a long war going on in ukraine as long as

23:43

he can do it something we need to remember is that chaos uh is in the national interests of

23:49

russia it dries up oil prices their second most important industry is armaments when the world thinks it's

23:56

always on the verge of world war three people are much more interested in buying arms and so that's going to help

24:01

the russian arms industry here's another scenario and several of these scenarios by the way can be simultaneously true

24:08

another scenario is the the spanish civil war before nazi germany launched

24:14

world war ii they wanted to make sure that their new weapons and tactics the blitzkrieg that enabled them to almost

24:20

win world war ii they wanted to make sure it would work and they wanted to have veteran soldiers who had combat experience and so they

24:28

used the spanish civil war to give combat experience to many of their soldiers and to test out their new

24:34

weapons and tactics i think it's no accident that russia is using some of it that's advanced weapons like the

24:40

hypersonic ice gunder has been launched i'm pretty sure that they didn't do that

24:46

just to destroy a building you know i i think the reason they're doing that is to test out their new weapon systems to

24:51

give experience to their troops and launching these systems to give troop to their experience to their ground troops

24:57

and to their general staffs and well here's how you actually fight a real war you know a veteran soldier who's got

25:04

combat experience who's been blooded is worth two or three soldiers who are green and who have never been exposed to

25:10

combat and i think that that's one of the things putin wants out of this war whether he's losing or not he's going to

25:16

value very highly the experience that his general staff and his ground troops have gotten out of ukraine so these are

25:22

all alternative theories to the one that is the only one that we're hearing on television every day the one that

25:29

has the happy face on it for us is that oh the russians are on the verge of defeat and we can jump in there and help

25:35

the ukrainians achieve a quick victory please be aware uh you know uh

25:41

there are at least several alternative theories that suggest that if we do that we're gonna be handed another

25:48

afghanistan another iraq another syria another libya another military disaster

25:54

except this one won't be a small one this one would be it could destroy nato and it could destroy the united states and it could

26:00

change the balance of power in the world if we're wrong about this assessment that we're hearing every day on television

26:07

yeah and it's interesting you say that theory because i've heard that and i don't know

26:12

if this is true like you say the fog of war but that a lot of the newer weapon systems aren't actually being used in

26:20

ukraine yet like the newer jets like the su i think it's the su-35 or is it the

26:25

42 one of their most advanced fighter jets um a lot of their air force hasn't

26:30

been deployed they're only as of recent using hypersonic weapons and it does

26:36

appear like a lot of that is you know like you say a potential testing ground

26:41

for these things so your your first theory of that you propose of them trying to

26:48

bait nato into a fight and appearing weak when they're in fact strong would make a lot of sense you know in light of

26:54

that because yeah we're not seeing a lot of their more advanced weaponry that they could bring

27:01

to bear being used at least we're not seeing it sure and to expand upon the points that you and i have both made uh

27:08

the russia only mobilized 200 000 troops to invade ukraine they have an army a standing army of a million men uh you

27:15

know only 75 of that 200 000 has actually gone into ukraine

27:20

uh they have 2000 aircraft in their air force they've only they haven't unleashed the air force really uh you

27:26

know uh ukraine has got 70 modern aircraft all these air victories that they're achieving are with 70 aircraft

27:34

uh the uh uh the the armata their new armata tank hasn't been sent in their

27:39

older model tanks they've sent in to the fight you they've got 20 000 tanks by the way and only

27:45

russia is fighting the war in ukraine with its fingers not with its fists you know uh it has vast conventional

27:52

military potential that has not been unleashed in ukraine and uh on these two things

27:57

these things too make me suspicious that what we're seeing on the ground is concocted and it's uh uh a fiction

28:06

that uh is intended to deceive us and maybe lure us into the war uh i could be wrong about that i hope i'm wrong about

28:12

that you know i hope the ukrainians are really doing as well as they're telling us they're doing but

28:19

even if they are uh russia is a nuclear superpower and uh if this thing if we

28:25

were to intervene it's a virtual certainty it would escalate uh and we would be the losers in the in that their

28:32

posture to win a nuclear war right now and we're very close to the edge right now i think the possibilities of

28:38

miscalculation are extremely even more worrisome to me than what russian designs may be you know world war one

28:45

started through a a single bullet fired into the chest of an austrian archduke

28:51

and through a series of miscalculations by the great powers that rapidly escalated into world war one and then in

28:58

just a few years there were 40 million casualties you know all because of miscalculation by the various sides who

29:05

by mobilizing their forces and the rest thought the others would stand down they didn't nobody intended for the war to

29:10

happen but it did nobody intends for a nuclear war to happen or a cyber or an emp war to

29:16

happen out of this thing or maybe the russians do intend it to happen on our side nobody wants that to happen but the

29:21

possibility of it happening through accident through miscalculation you know when the superpowers confront each other

29:27

is extremely high and ukraine in terms of its strategic importance is far more

29:32

important than little serbia was during world war one you know uh we need to

29:37

stay out of this thing my heart goes out to the ukrainians but the lesson we need to draw is

29:45

ukraine is what happens when the united states allows its military and nuclear

29:51

capabilities to become hollowed out and obsolete the other side sees that and then that tempts them into aggression

29:58

and we're going to see more acts of aggression unless we the best way to avenge ukraine is to

30:04

remember the lessons of ronald reagan and the strategy of peace through strength we need to make ourselves so

30:09

strong again in convent in our economy in our conventional weapons and in our nuclear weapons that no one will

30:15

challenge us that they will be afraid to go and invade ukraine because they're they'll be concerned about what the big

30:22

dog america will do so i wanted to ask you you talked briefly about

30:27

the super emp weapons and this is something which has uh been a bit elusive for me in

30:33

terms of understanding the mechanics of how that would actually work i've heard you talk before about

30:38

weapons that could be deployed that are very similar in their effect of emp

30:44

weapons minus the the radioactive fallout and stuff like that could you maybe just talk a bit more about those

30:50

types of that type of equipment and how it might actually be used in europe if you know push came to shove

30:58

sure one scenario that the emp commission uh looked at uh you know i was

31:05

definitely involved in the analysis and it's in one of my emp commission reports but we were concerned about a scenario

31:11

that could happen now over the crisis in ukraine uh that if russia wanted to defeat the

31:18

nato alliance it could do a nuclear emp attack on nato by detonating a

31:23

nuclear weapon a super emp weapon at high altitude 70 kilometers high that's

31:28

outside the atmosphere over nato headquarters in brussels and the resulting emp field would black out

31:34

electric grids from ireland uh united kingdom france all the way to the uk to the edge of ukraine uh the

31:42

whole nato alliance would be blacked out and when you've blacked out the electric grids all the other critical infrastructures failed too

31:48

there'd be no water food would start spoiling no telecommunications transportation systems wouldn't work

31:54

none of the things would work that you need to mobilize your forces to defend yourselves nato would in effect be

32:00

paralyzed by that one blow it would be a red carpet for those 20 000 russian tanks to reach the english channel

32:07

virtually unopposed uh so that's how a nuclear emp uh works

32:13

or in terms of the strategic application of a nuclear emp attack uh how does it work in terms of the

32:19

physics you know a uh an emp attack an emp is like a super energetic radio wave

32:24

and it's got so much energy in it that it will that it'll fry electronics so the electronics will be destroyed across

32:31

the area that the emp field is exposing and in this case that i just described the emp field would reach from from

32:38

eastern poland all the way to the uh to ireland uh with an emp attack like that you could do an emp attack over

32:44

north america that would do the same thing at an altitude of 300 kilometers

32:49

the field would cover most of canada all 48 contiguous united states and a good chunk of mexico and not only would our

32:56

civilian unprotected systems be destroyed by the super emp but our military systems as well because they're

33:03

not hardened that high you know during the cold war we only hardened them to 50 000 volts per meter which is a very high

33:10

level i mean imagine that 50 000 volts per meter you know but a super emp weapon can make a hundred thousand or

33:16

two hundred thousand volts per meter imagine if you had uh most of the things

33:21

in our electronic south society operate on 120 volts or less imagine if you had

33:27

a plug in your house that could generate a hundred thousand volts i mean what do you think would happen if you plugged

33:32

anything in that into that outlet obviously it would be destroyed and so in effect that's what you're doing when

33:38

you put an emp field down uh over a whole continent you know everything that's got electronics not everything

33:45

would be destroyed necessarily a lot of things even most things might survive but so much would be destroyed that it

33:52

would all come grinding to a halt you know it doesn't take much uh to stop a an electronic civilization

33:58

and to kill it uh it's like the body you know uh you don't have to destroy every organ in the body to kill a person uh

34:06

you know if if you destroy enough a few percentage but much stuff would be destroyed probably

34:12

much more than a few percentage than uh by a super emp weapon automobiles stop airplanes fall out of

34:18

the sky that sort of thing uh so don't you think though that if they were to deploy such a weapon

34:24

and i guess this is where i'd like to get more insight about the non-nuclear emp weapons because don't you think if

34:30

they were to deploy such a thing that that would basically bring the the full force of uh

34:37

nato into the war like with the us in terms of their nuclear arsenal like wouldn't that prompt a nuclear response

34:43

from the nuclear weapons have to work uh you know even the the nuclear weapons

34:48

the electronics in the delivery systems the bombers the icbms the ballistic

34:53

missile submarines these are vastly complicated electronic machines and uh they're only hardened to 50 000 volts

35:00

per meter their electronics are going to be vulnerable too uh and we might not even know who attacked us uh the first thing that gets

35:07

taken out by an emp are the satellites and the ballistic missile early warning radars uh the emp travels at the speed

35:13

of light uh you know uh in order for us to know who attacked us those things have to survive and then you have to

35:20

have the a retaliatory capability um you know the whole point of doing an emp would be to deny your adversary his

35:27

retaliatory capability by destroying it and i had uh dr arthur bradley on here and and we

35:35

talked about your paper that you had written about the potential use for a emp weapon in

35:41

europa and he said that one of the things that he he wasn't quite in agreement with was the

35:47

he thought that that would immediately prompt a nuclear response in the united states so you don't think so like

35:53

obviously on continental europa those systems might be might be fried you know potentially the

35:59

ones that aren't hardened but what about like what would the us response to that be like would they start launching nukes

36:06

at moscow or would there be like some deniability there like because

36:11

i think he even said that they would be able to see right when the nuke went up into space to

36:18

is that true or wealthy uh the united states would be able to see when the single missile went up into

36:24

space i did not either them or nate or their you know command and control in in europa would

36:31

be able to see that if they launched this emp weapon like right when they launched

36:38

it that we would detect it europa doesn't have the large phased array ballistic missile early warning radars

36:44

that we do and they're not aimed over the continent of europe what we would

36:50

pick up we might pick up if they decided to do it with an intermediate-range ballistic

36:55

missile uh you know we might pick up the launch of that single missile but a lot of missiles are being watched from

37:02

russia uh and how would we know that missile isn't intended uh armed with a conventional warhead or even if it's

37:09

armed with a nuclear warhead how do we know it's not going to go to the ground to attack an air base or something like that uh you know our satellites and our

37:16

our the north american air defense array is oriented for missiles coming over the north pole

37:22

to attack the united states not chiefly europe and you can do it clandestinely

37:27

you know you could launch a satellite and say this is a space launch vehicle and in fact the russians had a secret

37:33

weapon called the fractional orbital bombardment system china has it too now by they basically experimented with this

37:39

you could pretend that you're launching a space satellite for peaceful communications purposes but you've got a

37:45

a subaru emp warhead inside it north korea's got two satellites orbiting over north korea as we speak the kms3 and

37:52

kms4 that they declared our peaceful satellites but the emp commission has

37:57

warned that these things could be armed with super emp warheads uh you know and they might be orbiting us so that in an

38:04

emergency uh north korea could detonate you know when they need to to do an emp attack there's all kinds of ways of you

38:11

could launch the emp out of a out of a uh attack submarine you know a cruise missile that goes to high

38:17

altitude uh they've got such uh missiles one of them they mark it internationally

38:23

it's called the club k and it flies at sub at uh uh

38:28

at uh subsonic speeds for a long period of time along close to the water but then at the last minute it can go up to

38:35

high altitude high enough to do an empty attack at super speeds so they have many

38:40

platforms many different ways of doing it that don't involve icbms that would be detectable by radar

38:46

ballistic missiles by us and that is the question that your friend has said and

38:53

that is the usual answer uh that's what a lot of people have an inherent faith in is

38:59

well surely if russia made a nuclear attack on uh on on european nato uh the

39:05

united states is gonna respond and that's what's gonna deter it that has been the whole basis of uh

39:11

the belief of mutual destruction that's what we've been gambling and that's why the united states needs to modernize and

39:18

build up its strategic forces so that we are credible about that uh you know uh it doesn't help deterrence

39:25

when biden president biden meets in geneva with putin and says a nuclear war

39:31

cannot be won and must never be fought that reassures the russians and chinese and north koreans that that's what we

39:37

believe okay uh but they need to be convinced that we are willing to use nuclear weapons to

39:42

come to the defense of our friends that's a huge assumption would the united states put itself at risk you

39:49

know to save nato europe that's the promise that's what everybody assumes but when it really comes down to it do

39:54

the russians really believe that we would do that i think they're impressed with our behavior in ukraine i mean

40:00

maybe that's why lindsey graham and others want us to go in uh you know uh right now american policy in ukraine is

40:07

to fight to the death of the last brave ukrainian and apply economic sanctions

40:13

against russia as if that's really doing something how many times have we applied economic sanctions and they've done

40:18

nothing we've done it against iran against north korea against china they're they're economic sanctions don't seem to

40:25

accomplish anything when economic sanctions really work they can actually provoke a war that's

40:32

why japan attacked pearl harbor because fdr wanted them to stop attacking china and so he employs the an oil sanction on

40:40

on japan and they had to make a choice do we surrender to the economic sanctions from the degenerate americans

40:46

who are not willing to to fight us or do we launch pearl harbor and take

40:52

over established our southeast asia prosperity's co-prosperity sphere

40:57

invading the philippines invading southeast asia and achieve our dream of of a japanese

41:03

pacific empire they chose most military dictatorships only respect military

41:09

strength and that's what the japanese did so uh you know we're not what we're doing here in ukraine

41:16

uh isn't building up our credibility that we're willing to uh take existential

41:22

risks in order to save our friends yeah you know you bring up such a great

41:27

point that i don't think a lot of it goes back to that fundamental belief about mutually assured destruction is we

41:33

take for granted this notion that you know we're suddenly going to jump in and

41:38

just because russia uses a nuke over there that we're suddenly going to jump in and be the saviors and put our

41:44

own existence at risk but uh you know perhaps our our military generals

41:51

you know aren't going to play that game and maybe russia knows it and they're going to call the bluff as you see exactly

41:58

i think they're calling the bluff now uh and uh that's why they invaded ukraine because they don't believe it anymore uh

42:05

they don't believe that we are credible when it comes to our nuclear security guarantees why should

42:10

they when we have allowed our nuclear triad to become obsolete and when we have nuclear weapons that are

42:17

have been untested in 30 years but congress accepts every year the national laboratories every year uh

42:24

they get certified the nuclear weapons still work even though we haven't tested them and even though we're patching them

42:29

together but does the russians and chinese believe that they've been testing their nuclear weapons uh the

42:34

state department uh admitted last year that they've been violating the comprehensive test ban treaty for 30

42:40

years and they've been doing low yield tests of their nuclear weapons so they can have confidence their nuclear

42:46

inventory is going to work everything out of our mouths and everything we do would lead our adversaries to think that

42:52

we don't take nuclear deterrence seriously anymore and i think they're calling our bluff right now i'm almost

42:59

reluctant to say this because this is a canadian audience all right uh you know mostly actually an american audience

43:05

believe it or not okay but as an advocate of national interest you know of america first and in a national

43:11

interest you know uh if i were advising a president and russia started a nuclear

43:16

war in nato you know i'd say uh i don't think i would advise the

43:22

president to put america at risk to save the nato member states who who have

43:28

basically not done their job to maintain their militaries at a

43:33

sufficient level of strength to deter the russians you know that's been a long complaint from us

43:39

i mean they have allowed their military strength to so deteriorate that they've become tempting i mean i think one of

43:45

the other reasons russia has been willing to invade ukraine is that they know nato is militarily hollow

43:51

i mean do you know that uh i mean there was a time during the cold war when russia when germany you know had uh uh a

43:59

couple of thousand main battle tanks germany has 250 main battle tanks today

44:05

but we had 5 000 main battle tanks in germany during the cold war uh obama

44:10

took them all out there were zero main battle tanks us main battle tanks in europe under obama trump started putting

44:17

some back in but we only have a hundred main battle tanks in germany today you know one of the reasons the ukrainians

44:23

are doing so well is the ukraine has as many main battle tanks

44:29

uh as the united kingdom france germany and the benelux countries combined you

44:36

know that's one of the reasons they may be doing so well against the the russians because they've got many more

44:41

bad main battle tanks than european nato has the other part of the equation going

44:46

back to the scenarios you know if ukraine is achieving big victory over

44:51

the russians and that happens to be true is that uh even if it's true does that mean it should jump into it let's not

44:57

forget by the russians fighting the ukrainian army they're in effect fighting the russian army the ukrainian general

45:05

staff and their troops were trained by the russians they're using russian military equipment ukrainians know how

45:11

the russian general staff thinks that may be another reason why if they're doing well

45:16

they're doing they're doing well uh why would we assume that uh that we would find the same fortune

45:23

assuming the ukrainians are meeting with good fortune we haven't tested our stuff against you against russian plans

45:29

russian equipment the russian way of warfare uh you know we might be very surprised to discover that our

45:35

hollowed-out militaries the european nato don't do well on the ukrainian battlefield we and we can't even do it

45:41

by the way uh you know nato has never exercised projecting large numbers of

45:46

general purpose forces into eastern europe the defense of western european nato at the height of the cold war was

45:53

always defensive the russians were supposed to attack and we were supposed to hold them off and we thought we would

45:58

have to resort to tactical nuclear weapons in order to hold them off you know this idea that we're going to project power into eastern europe and

46:04

defeat the russians sounds very napoleonic to me i don't mean 1805 napoleon i mean 1812 napoleonic

46:12

when he when he led the french army the grand army into russia and it ended up getting destroyed by general winter and

46:19

by the uh by the russian army but to go back to your to your friend i mean uh uh it's all

46:25

again it all depends on credibility you know he speaks with such great certainty that yes the united states would do that

46:31

uh i don't know that that's clear at all we hope or at least our european allies

46:36

hope the united states would do that japan hopes that we will come to their rescue uh you know uh

46:43

our other partners in the pacific hopes that we would use our nuclear weapons to defend them to

46:49

deter the nuclear umbrella but the nuclear umbrella is old and tattered and

46:54

tired and even our and at least this current political leadership seems to

47:00

believe in it so little that he would that that in geneva last summer he said a nuclear war cannot be

47:06

fought cannot be won and should never be fought forgetting that the united states has won a nuclear war you know we won

47:12

world war ii that was a nuclear war the russians know that you can certainly win a nuclear war against any country that

47:18

doesn't have nuclear weapons and that's most of the world you know but we seem to have forgotten that lesson uh the

47:24

assumption that a nuclear war can't be won is based all on this hope or this premise that the united states will be

47:31

there for our allies and be willing to put our own homeland at risk uh even if they attack latvia you know

47:38

with a nuclear weapon most americans can't even find latvia on a map someone once said never promised to go

47:44

to nuclear war for a country you can't find on a map you know we could have a whole other conversation

47:49

about whether we should have expanded nato in the first place i don't think we should have because it created this very

47:55

situation uh when i was a young when i was a young man i was on the house armed services committee and i had the nato

48:01

portfolio and one of my jobs was to go to these east european countries that were former warsaw back countries and

48:07

come back and advise congress on whether we should expand nato to the east or not and i said we shouldn't you know these

48:13

countries are really not capable of defending themselves their economies are weak they're going to be dependent uh we

48:19

we can't defend them we can't project power the only way we can defend them is with our our

48:24

nuclear deterrent so we are going to basically be making a problem giving a promissory note to countries like

48:30

estonia and latvia lithuania slovakia you know the czech republic all these

48:37

former warsaw pac member states a promissory note that we're going to go to nuclear war to defend their sovereignty

48:43

as a footnote to the ukraine war by the way one of the main reasons russia has

48:49

invaded ukraine is because it believed that ukraine was going to become a member of nato

48:55

and that even if we didn't officially make ukraine a member of nato that it had in effect was becoming a de facto

49:02

member of nato aren't we behaving exactly as if that's true and uh isn't our behavior and this

49:08

war mongering that's going on playing right in to the paranoid views of the russian general staff and a lot of the

49:15

russian people that look if putin was right we were planning to make

49:21

ukraine a member of nato and we're behaving just as if they're really a member of nato you know

49:26

my heart believes for the ukrainians but uh you know but our own the survival of

49:32

our own nations come first you know the lesson we need to draw from this is that we can't afford to be militarily weak

49:38

anymore we've got to rebuild our strength had we had we maintained that military strength and pursued the peace through

49:45

strength strategy maybe russia would have remained contained and uh and ukraine not become

49:50

a victim and i i have this fascinating stuff i could listen to you talk about this

49:56

stuff all day but i just have a couple specific questions um one is with respect to

50:02

the icbms and the submarines i had a couple commenters on a recent video

50:07

say that there is icbms on the submarines i just want to know if you can maybe comment a bit about that can

50:15

you just explain in more detail what the capabilities of the submarines is because for everybody for most people

50:20

that's the the big one of the triad and that's our primary tools in the arsenal now if

50:27

you're saying that that is uh limited in its capability and maybe you could talk about how many submarines

50:34

are on patrol at any given time to the best of your ability of course uh the ohio class submarines that we

50:40

have now that were built during the reagan administration are armed with the trident missile this is a sub-launch

50:45

ballistic missile it's not an intercontinental ballistic missile it's an intermediate-range ballistic missile

50:51

the trident can't reach russia from its port it can't launch from port and we don't even have command and control

50:57

arrangements at our port facilities to launch those missiles because they don't have the range they have to go

51:03

to the mid-atlantic or mid-pacific to their patrol areas to be able to

51:09

reach russia most of our submarines are not at sea uh you know it used to be during the height

51:14

of the cold war that about half of them would be important then about half of them at sea but because the trident has

51:20

become so aged we've reduced the operational tempo of the trident ballistic missile submarines so that

51:25

only about a third of them are at sea at any time we have a fleet of about 14

51:31

trident ohio-class ballistic missile submarines most of them are important uh you know

51:36

we only have about four of them at sea at any time two in the atlantic and two in the pacific

51:41

so they're basically so though all those submarines are sitting ducks the ballistic missile submarines at port

51:48

would be destroyed in a surprise attack our ballistic our strategic bombers that take three days to mobilize would be

51:53

destroyed in a surprise attack if they could beat us to the draw they can destroy our icbms in their silos one of

51:59

the purposes of an emp attack would be to paralyze our command and control systems so that we would not be able to rapidly launch our silo based icbms and

52:07

that would give that russians the opportunity the capability to destroy those

52:12

those icbms the minuteman and their silos and it would also get a system

52:17

kill of our ballistic missile submarines that are on control at sea because our ballistic missile submarines do not

52:23

carry unlocking codes they have to get an emergency action message from the president

52:28

which includes unlocking codes so that we could then unlock the weapons and missiles so they could be fired if you

52:35

fail to get uh the uh emergency action message the submarines are useless

52:41

and uh that is another reason for doing the emp attack because it will destroy the command and control

52:46

arrangements that are necessary to uh to uh utilize the submarines on

52:52

patrol at sea this is not the case with the russians and i was trying to contrast this in my earlier talk because

52:57

the russians do have icbms on their on their submarines they have arranged to reach the united states right from port

53:04

this is because they're such big believers in surprise attack if we launch a surprise attack not only can

53:09

they launch their icbms that they're going to launch those icbm support and if they want to launch a surprise attack

53:15

they can do it with their icbms with their ballistic missile submarines at port and with the ballistic missile

53:21

submarines at sea because they have these undersea cables where they can hook in to get emergency action messages

53:27

secretly so that's a huge difference between our

53:33

strategic posture and theirs as i said at the beginning our strategic posture and the russian strategic posture is as

53:40

different as night and day ours our strategic forces are designed for transparency and for deterrence and

53:46

what's called crisis stability you know so that the other side doesn't start getting suspicious that we're going to make a surprise attack against them in

53:52

the middle of a crisis like ukraine war the russian strategic posture is designed for fighting a war for winning

53:59

a war and to do so by achieving a surprise attack that's why they have put most of their eggs almost all their

54:05

nuclear weapons on intercontinental ballistic missiles both in silos mobile icbms and their sea based deterrent

54:12

things that can be launched in a few minutes with very little warning and what about aircraft carriers do they

54:19

have any capability to project nuclear the views do uh we used

54:25

to have tactical nuclear weapons on our aircraft carriers and our on our attack submarines uh

54:31

not the ballistic missile submarines but the attack submarines they would have slickens on them some launch cruise

54:36

missiles that would have tactical nuclear warheads but we took all of that away during the cold war in fact the

54:42

united states unilaterally dismantled under the presidential nuclear initiative

54:48

president bush the first president bush arrived in agreement with president yeltsin uh you know that we were going

54:55

to get rid of tactical nuclear weapons both sides were supposed to dismantle their tactical nuclear weapons this was

55:01

during the last year of the bush administration and we did we got rid of almost all of our tactical nuclear weapons including

55:07

those that were deployed on aircraft carriers and submarines uh today we only have about 180 tactical nuclear weapons

55:14

left we we stopped dismantling them when the state department finally admitted that the russians were cheating on the

55:20

presidential nuclear initiative they did not follow our example uh and uh they did dismantle about 75

55:27

of their tactical nuclear weapons maybe you know we can't independently verify that right but they themselves have said

55:33

that they've dismantled 75 but that still leaves them potentially with at least 2 000 we know they have at

55:40

least 2 000 tactical nuclear weapons versus fewer than 200 for us

55:45

and they may have as many as 8 000 tactical nuclear weapons and all uh most of their tactical nuclear weapons are

55:52

new generation nuclear weapons designed to produce no radioactive fallout designed for very low yields or

56:00

selectable yields so you could do anything from blowing up a bridge to blasting a whole you know division of

56:06

tanks with that same uh with that same weapon for special effects like emp effects on the battlefield emp effects

56:12

for anti-aircraft purposes x-rays for anti-missile purposes we don't have anything like that in our inventory uh

56:20

they they even probably have air-to-air nuclear missiles in order to compensate for our advantage our technological

56:27

advantages in in our aircraft uh nuclear artillery you know uh uh you know i

56:33

wouldn't be surprised if their tanks have got uh nuclear rounds in them so that they could win a tank battle one

56:39

tank could win a tank battle perhaps against the whole company of of of our best tanks they are prepared to fight

56:45

and win a nuclear war at every level you know on the battlefield uh in europe uh

56:51

or strategically between the homelands uh and maybe just in closings i know you

56:56

you have to go but what do you think is the likelihood of like the true likelihood of something

57:03

like this uh occurring i know the us right now at least is looking at upgrading their their nuclear defense

57:10

system i heard a figure of like 634 billion dollars over the next 10 years and i don't know how

57:17

uh if that's credible or if that's something which has been passed yet in congress but

57:22

is what do you think the likelihood is where we're at now with what's going on in eastern europe of an actual like if

57:28

you were to put it at like a percentage you know of nuclear uh weapons being

57:33

used and i know it's totally arbitrary but uh you know just to give our viewers a sense of because we're all about

57:40

preparedness here and trying to prepare for these events and i live in saskatchewan which is right above the

57:47

you know north dakota montana that whole uh place where they got the icbms so you

57:53

know a lot of people want to know like what is the real threat of this at this point in time well we are investing uh that problem

58:00

that's not an unrealistic figure but what it's going to buy us uh is new submarines

58:07

new icbms and new bombers in the 2030s okay we're 10 years away from getting

58:14

any of those systems we're really far behind and it's not going to get us new weapons we're still

58:20

going to be stuck with the same old weapons uh you know we need to do a lot more than that and i know it's going to be a

58:26

big bill but if we were keeping pace with the russians and the chinese all along it wouldn't be such a

58:33

big bill you know we've been on a nuclear deterrence holiday for 30 years so what can one expect at the end of the

58:38

day it's obviously going to be a big bill to catch up that's why i recommended i don't even know if we can

58:43

catch up we're so far behind in the technologies and the modernity of the systems that's why i think we need to

58:49

give a real high priority to strategic defensive systems harden on our grids

58:54

hardening uh against both cyber and emp and deploying space-based missile defenses so that we can technologically

59:00

leapfrog past this and change the nature of the competition you know what is the likelihood of this

59:05

happening you know such things are always impossible to answer you know i mean it would just be a guess

59:11

we are certainly at a an elevated risk i think the danger of a nuclear conflict

59:17

of both law whether it starts and the escalatory possibilities i think

59:23

our situation today is more dangerous than the cuban missile crisis we have never before put ourselves in a

59:29

situation where the adversary has declared the mobilization of his forces and is postured for surprise attack

59:35

while we just do nothing you know kennedy during the cuban missile crisis raised the defcon level of our of our

59:42

nuclear deterrent almost as almost as high as he could without actually getting in a nuclear war he actually

59:47

went to defcon 2 which is just short of actually getting into nuclear war and as a consequence he was able to de-escalate

59:54

the cuban missile crisis and and and prevail in that crisis this is the first time we've ever faced you know a real

1:00:00

possibility of a surprise nuclear attack but we've left our forces at defcon 5. you know uh

1:00:06

and i think biden has done that for political reasons because he doesn't want to admit that we're in a nuclear crisis but it leaves our forces

1:00:13

vulnerable the submarines are not at sea the bombers are not being mobilized the icbms of their normal everyday readiness

1:00:20

uh the command and crucial command and control assets which are particularly the tacoma

1:00:26

aircraft all of them are tinker air force base almost all of them except for two on a normal situation we keep one on

1:00:33

the on the atlantic coast and one on the pacific coast but all of them almost all of them are just sitting ducks sitting

1:00:38

there at tinker they should have been dispersed but they haven't been so the opportunity for our adversary

1:00:45

is very good if he wanted to do it now and the geostrategic situation that we

1:00:51

are facing right now for years and years everyone has agreed uh you know that a

1:00:56

scenario that is most likely to result in a nuclear war is exactly the one we're looking at now where the two

1:01:02

superpowers become engaged in a big war in europe and that's what's happened uh you know that's your most important

1:01:08

indicator uh so you know i think i can't put a percentage on it uh uh you know

1:01:14

but even a small increase in the possibility of an existential threat should be unacceptable to us you know

1:01:21

because the consequences are are doomed you know uh and i think there's been at

1:01:26

least an increase by a small percentage i think it's personally i think it's much bigger than

1:01:32

that i think we're very close to the edge and let's hope that the critics are not are not right that putin has gone

1:01:39

crazy that he's uh facing an internal revoke by his own elites people are sort

1:01:44

of celebrating that and cheering that on uh i can't think of an even more dangerous situation than a major war in

1:01:50

europa where the two superpowers are involved and one side is crazy i mean uh

1:01:56

that's not uh you can't put a happy face on that scenario when it comes to the prospect

1:02:01

of nuclear war yeah and i just want to conclude in saying that you know i've had a lot of people

1:02:08

comment on the channel about how well you know we have secret weapons and you know this exceptionalist view that i

1:02:15

think for a lot of people is uh something an idea they hold on to to

1:02:21

comfort themselves to that we you know we might not be sharing our plans but

1:02:26

you know we have a plan don't worry you know but to me you know that's a very convenient

1:02:32

uh thing for us to believe but you know what

1:02:38

psychiatrists call it denial behavior you know people who don't don't want to face up to reality we're a very open

1:02:44

society it's very hard for us to keep secrets you know i i wish it were

1:02:49

true you know that we had secret weapons that were stored away uh you know and all of this uh and our vulnerability is

1:02:55

not a fact i had described russian strategic culture as one of dysfunctional of paranoia okay our

1:03:01

strategic culture i describe as dysfunctional optimism you know and that's exactly the kind of thing that

1:03:07

you get from our strategic culture we don't we don't want to face up to the hard scary facts we would prefer to see the

1:03:14

bright side if there's any way of of seeing a bright side we we look at that side oh the russians are being beaten in

1:03:20

ukraine they're they're winning that's got to be the reality it can't be that there's some other alternative theory

1:03:25

that isn't that isn't as positive for our side uh and if there isn't a

1:03:30

positive reality for us to uh or a positive possibility for us to look to then we invent things we'll actually

1:03:37

invent uh scenarios that that don't even exist like oh well we've got a secret weapon that's gonna change everything

1:03:44

and uh and so we don't have to worry about that i can go back to living the good life and having a good time and

1:03:49

sleep well at night you know and uh and this has gotten us into

1:03:54

trouble in all of our wars too every one of these defeats that we've had since the end of world war including

1:04:01

the beginning of world war ii itself has come out of a strategic culture of dysfunctional optimism where we think

1:04:08

you know if all all conflicts can be negotiated away and if they can't be negotiated

1:04:13

away you know then we can get in there and uh and uh and our military primacy

1:04:19

is always gonna win and uh and and we can reconstruct the victim society the

1:04:24

the other side share it along our own image and to share our values and i

1:04:29

don't know how many times we have to have have to lose a war you know to learn the lesson we never seem to

1:04:35

learn and maybe it's impossible for us to learn maybe it's our hubris you know because it's the nature of our strategic

1:04:41

culture uh you know which is uh uh rooted in this but that's why we have specialists and experts who are supposed

1:04:47

to worry about these things for us on the last we don't listen to them there have been people telling us and warning

1:04:53

us the bomb designers the missile designers the department of defense has been warning for many years you know the

1:04:58

deterrent is getting old uh you know it's it's it's uh it's almost uh it's

1:05:04

almost at the point where it has no credibility at all anymore and people have been ignoring them uh in fact in

1:05:11

fact the administration this is the dysfunctional optimism is to the point of fantasy now you know because

1:05:19

the people who the anti-nuclear activists who are who are not a fringe group anymore they

1:05:25

they are in the biden administration the bible administration important part of their political base are anti-nuclear

1:05:30

activists they have there are important positions in the biden administration that anti-nuclear activists have been

1:05:36

appointed to there are leading members of congress in very important positions like adam smith who's in effect an

1:05:42

anti-nuclear activist he's the chairman of the house armed services committee after president biden he's the second

1:05:47

most important america man in america that is to decide whether we're going to modernize our nuclear deterrent and our

1:05:54

conventional forces because he controls the defense budget and adam smith has been for banning our icbms getting rid

1:06:01

of our strategic bombers and cutting the ballistic missile submarine fleet in half because we don't need because he

1:06:08

believes in minimum deterrence and mutual assured destruction and nuclear weapons are unusable and you can't win a

1:06:13

nuclear war so all we need is the bare minimum and we'll be okay and these people haven't given up on that even in

1:06:20

in the situation that we're going through now they're the biden administration has been holding off on

1:06:25

the nuclear posture review which could make all of this come true all of these bad things could come true biden's a

1:06:31

nuclear posture review they haven't changed their minds despite the fact of this uh uh being on the clo on the edge

1:06:38

of a nuclear conflict with russia over ukraine so this this is another example of denial

1:06:44

behavior and what a strategic culture of dysfunctional optimists will do

1:06:50

yeah i agree and it would appear to me that if you had something like that you would want to put it

1:06:56

out there that you had it as a deterrence you know because that would be in line with our strategy thus far

1:07:03

you don't have it right exactly yeah well anyways it's been great having you on today and i appreciate you uh

1:07:09

coming on sharing your piece i hope that you would come back and join us again i'm going to you know we're going to put

1:07:16

this out there for the community and if they have questions we will compile some more questions for you and as this whole

1:07:22

thing progresses i'm sure you know your insights are bound to change and evolve

1:07:27

as well so thanks a lot for coming out well thank you so much for having me i look forward to returning

1:07:34

awesome thank you again take care the best way to support this channel is

1:07:39

to support yourself by gearing up at canadianpreparedness.com where you'll find high quality survival

1:07:45

gear at the best prices no junk and no gimmicks use discount code prepping gear

1:07:50

for 10 off don't forget the strong survive but the prepared thrive stay

1:07:55

safe